at least one ink fixative in combination with said pigment composition in said ink-receiving layer, said ink fixative comprising at least one quaternary amine emulsion polymer which is compatible with said material selected from the group consisting of boehmite, pseudo-boehmite, and a mixture thereof and substantially avoids inducement of gellation and increases in viscosity of said material so that said ink-receiving layer may be comprised of at least about 65% by weight of said material, said ink-receiving layer comprising about 1 - 30% by weight of said quaternary amine emulsion polymer; and

a plurality of binders, said plurality of binders comprising a first binder composition comprised of polyvinyl alcohol, a second binder composition comprised of a poly(vinyl acetate-ethylene) copolymer, and a third binder composition comprised of a poly(vinyl pyrrolidone-vinyl acetate) copolymer.--

Remarks

In the Examiner's 4/10/03 Office Action on Page 2, Claims 4 - 8 (the only remaining claims) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (Second Paragraph). The Examiner specifically indicated that independent Claim 4 was allegedly indefinite regarding the use of "at least about 65%" in Claim 4 relative to the amount of pigment being employed. Likewise, Claims 4 - 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of various references recited in the current Office Action on Pages 3 - 6. In the present Response, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of Claims 4 - 8 based on the information and arguments presented below which clearly support the allowance of these claims under all applicable guidelines. Furthermore, new Claim 22 has been added which is allowable for the many reasons given below. The objections to Claims 4 - 8 will now be addressed in the order in which they appeared in the 4/10/03 Office Action, followed by a discussion of new Claim 22.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112 (Second Paragraph)

On Page 2 of the current Office Action, Claims 4 - 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (Second Paragraph) as allegedly being indefinite based on the use of "at least about 65%" in